

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the

Western District of North Carolina

United States of America)

v.)

JOHN MARK JOHNSON)

Date of Previous Judgment: February 26, 2002)

(Use Date of Last Amended Judgment if Applicable))

Case No: 1:01CR00011-001

USM No: 16739-058

Pro se

Defendant's Attorney

Order Regarding Motion for Sentence Reduction Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)

Upon motion of ☒ the defendant ☐ the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ☐ the court under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment imposed based on a guideline sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(u), and having considered such motion,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is:

☒ DENIED. ☐ GRANTED and the defendant's previously imposed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in the last judgment issued) of _____ months **is reduced to** _____.

I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELINE RANGE (Prior to Any Departures)

Previous Offense Level: _____

Amended Offense Level: _____

Criminal History Category: _____

Criminal History Category: _____

Previous Guideline Range: _____ to _____ months

Amended Guideline Range: _____ to _____ months

II. SENTENCE RELATIVE TO AMENDED GUIDELINE RANGE

- ☐ The reduced sentence is within the amended guideline range.
- ☐ The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less than the guideline range applicable to the defendant at the time of sentencing as a result of a departure or Rule 35 reduction, and the reduced sentence is comparably less than the amended guideline range.
- ☒ Other (explain): No reduction since the original calculations involved cocaine powder, not cocaine base.

III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Except as provided above, all provisions of the judgment dated February 26, 2002 shall remain in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Order Date: March 24, 2009

Effective Date: _____
(if different from order date)



Lacy H. Thornburg
United States District Judge

